

**Wisconsin Child and Family Services Review  
Program Enhancement Plan Implementation Team  
Continuous Quality Improvement Process and County Child Welfare Reviews  
Group Discussion**

November 29, 2004

1. How can the results of the CQI process benefit: your county, the state, tribes, and other stakeholders?
  - Presents opportunity to redesign service delivery.
  - Provides opportunities to talk about outcomes locally especially during budget time.
  - Long term care services compete with money to improve child welfare services – this provides information to address these issues.
  - Educate community including other stakeholders.
  - Provides common frame of reference to include other stakeholders in improving services.
  - Provides common language in a state with much local control. Gives us a base to start from that's common across the state.
  - This will show best practices – same expectations statewide.
  - Better outcomes for tribal children.
  - Will force us to find quantitative measures and outcomes as we can see what is bought with money expended.
  - Allows us to analyze why there are differences among counties – does local property tax mean more access to services?
  - Looks at the system in a holistic way.
  - Opportunity to look at new way of doing things. Challenge to encourage risk taking/innovation to achieve outcomes we want to achieve.
  
2. What concerns do you associate with CQI reviews and what will be important for us to consider as we design and approach the review process?
  - Make sure we get input from consumers – will they be able to access the bulletin board?
  - Process should be used to provide ongoing input.
  - Electronic bulletin board should be organized topically so it's easy to navigate.
  - Do periodic summaries of issues on the bulletin board.
  - Must have the right people conducting the reviews.
  - High turnover in child welfare staff – if we better train staff and give them manageable workloads we can better work with families because it will reduce turnover.
  - Data standards put in place to measure outcomes should be data counties are currently using so they can easily provide it. Must use common data elements.
  - Need to recognize what families see as most important.
  - Concerns about federal outcomes – are we reinforcing faulty outcomes – need to look at this and make sure we are using what we think are the best outcomes.
  - Process needs to focus on quality improvement and best practice as we define it in Wisconsin.
  - Focus is too much on one-size fits all – need to allow for creativity and flexibility.
  - How can the process respect Wisconsin's values of common terms, outcomes, data and the desire for local control?
  - How can we involve partners and make them also responsible for the outcomes (law enforcement, etc.)?
  - How can we get private partners involved in the process as well?

Question 2, continued.

- Must agree on how we should do the work – but won't have sufficient resources to do it right. The feedback from the reviews must be shared with the legislature and the public to get the resources to do the job right.
- Use a holistic approach.
- Who will be conducting the reviews?
- Are we allowing for local differences as long as we achieve the same outcomes?
- Will we consider what is learned through the interview process?
- Need to define child welfare so we can work with other stakeholders.
- Will there be a group of people who know best practice or know how to measure outcomes as we select the staff to do QI reviews?
- The reviewers must know child welfare but also how to organize a complex process, have communication skills to give feedback and be comfortable with data.
- Will we measure based on how we define best practice or will we look at outcomes and let local agencies help to define best practice?
- Quality assurance versus quality improvement – what will we define as the approach?
- At what point do we have cumulative data for comparison to determine if it's a statewide/broad-based issue?
- What is the interface between BMCW QA process and the TMG QI process?
- Is there a way to reinforce that it's not just the county human service's responsibility to assure safety for kids?
- Assess best practice and then provide technical assistance to help counties improve their practice.
- Make sure it's an opportunity for the county to learn. Provide opportunity for interaction with local staff so they can learn throughout the review process.

3. What do you see as the role of the county in the onsite review?

- Involve birth parents through stakeholder groups in QI process.
- Need to include other stakeholders not just child welfare agency. Must include court system.
- County child welfare agency should get other stakeholders involved so they understand – bring together to explain process and what will be expected of them.
- Counties must be open to receiving feedback – won't do well in every area and must be open to improvement.
- Must have ongoing process to work together and provide input – can't wait until it's time for the review.
- County must assure workers that liability doesn't just fall on them – shared responsibility to improve.
- Counties with Tribes must include them as stakeholders. In large urban areas, tribal representatives should be included. ICWA representative is also key.
- Policy makers at the county level must be involved (county board, human service committee) so they are on board when change needs to be made. Responsibility shared by county administration.
- Form multi-disciplinary team to discuss CAN issues.

4. What process or protocol would you like to see followed when receiving the results of the CQI reviews?
  - The state shouldn't share it with the media.
  - Give advance copy to the county before it is made public and give them the opportunity to discuss errors and time to respond.
  - Make the results strength based and include a breakdown of issues and who might be responsible for making the change.
  - Hold a brief exit interview and then sit down with the county to review the draft results before the final copy is shared.
  - Share when a deficiency is found – what are the state's recommendations to address and improve – include those with the results.
  - Identify who holds the solution (i.e. it might not be with the child welfare system – it might be law enforcement or other systems).
  - At what point must the results of the review become public? Does the state have to provide information to the press before local agency has a chance to review?
5. What are your thoughts regarding how the results should be shared and with who?
  - The results should be shared with the human services director and they will share with the county board, child welfare management staff, the media and others.
  - Provide an executive summary for the county board.
  - Share with the press after the director and board has had a chance to review and comment.
  - We must consider the state's role if they get a request to release the results.
  - Post on DHFS website but only after the county has been given the opportunity to respond to any deficiencies.
  - Should the report be shared with the consumers in the county?
  - Broad based roll out with many partners.
  - Process should not be different than what counties currently do for long term care reviews.
  - Must be documented.
  - How will the public information be handled?
  - Should a small group of key stakeholders receive the report so it's identified as a joint responsibility?
6. In addition to the CFSR case review items, are there other case related activities you would like feedback on?
  - Must include consumers' view of the assessment process and outcomes from their perspective.
  - What is the role of the court in not allowing kids to return home?
  - Identification of all outside partners (courts, community, partners, etc) so we can communicate to them.
  - Internal systemic issues – identify areas of weakness including staff/worker ratios
  - CST & NGA initiative now going on – how do these fit into the CQI process and contribute to the outcomes.